arXiv:1512.01403v2 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 30 Aug 2016

The Canonical Distribution without Thermodynamic Limit

[1]Thomas Oikonomou* and [2]G. Baris Bagci
[1]*Department of Physics, School of Science and Technology, Nazarbayev University, 53 Kabanbay Batyr Ave., Astana 010000, Kazakhstan and*
[2]*Department of Materials Science and Nanotechnology Engineering, TOBB University of Economics and Technology, 06560 Ankara, Turkey*
(Dated: August 31, 2016)

We derive the continuous canonical distribution only by requiring the extensivity of the mean energy and the multiplicative probabilistic composition rule. The derivation is independent of the thermodynamic limit and moreover it does not use the usual equal a priori probability postulate. We numerically demonstrate the implications of our derivation for the free and oscillating molecules.

PACS numbers: 05.20.-y; 05.20.Dd; 05.20.Gg; 51.30.+i
Keywords: canonical distribution; equal a priori probability postulate; thermodynamic limit; extensivity

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of statistical equilibrium thermodynamics has been developed to describe the macroscopic behaviour of physical systems in terms of their microscopic structure, namely the dynamic of their constituent elements such as particles and molecules. A pivotal issue of this approach is the determination of the energy probability distribution $P(E_r)$ of the system under consideration. For this, one first needs to determine the probability $\mathcal{P}_j$ that, at any time t, the system is to be found in a state j characterized by the energy value E_j. Then, factorizing the former states into groups of states with the same energy levels E_r, $j(\text{states}) \to r(\text{levels})$, one obtains the desired energy distribution $P(E_r) = \Omega(E_r)\mathcal{P}_{j\to r}$, where $\Omega(E_r)$ is the system's degeneracy number of the rth energy level. According to the fundamental equiprobability postulate of statistical mechanics, all the accessible energy states occur equally likely at thermal equilibrium, so that $\mathcal{P}_j$ is given its classical definition as a probability.

Considering then a system at canonical thermal equilibrium, that is a system of variable energy E_j due to its contact with an N'-molecule heat bath, the probability $\mathcal{P}_j$ is computed as proportional to the microstates $\Omega'(E'_j)$ (equiprobability postulate) of the heat bath, where E_{tot} denotes the constant total energy of the system plus the thermal bath, i.e., $E_{\text{tot}} = E'_j + E_j$. Then, considering the heat bath in the thermodynamic limit, $N' \to \infty$, so that the energy levels E'_j are a continuum, $E'_j \to E'$ and assuming further that E' is overwhelmingly larger than the energy E_j of the system, thus satisfying the condition $E' \approx E_{\text{tot}}$, one performs a Taylor expansion of $\Omega'(E')$ around $E' \to E_{\text{tot}}$ to obtain [1]

$$\mathcal{P}_j \propto \Omega'(E'_j) \propto e^{-\beta' E_j}\,, \tag{1}$$

where $\beta' := \frac{\partial \ln \Omega'(E_{\text{tot}})}{\partial E_{\text{tot}}}$. The exponential term in Eq. (1) is called Boltzmann factor. Then, the canonical energy distribution of the system is determined as

$$P(E_r) = \Omega(E_r)\mathcal{P}_{j\to r} = \frac{\Omega(E_r)\, e^{-\beta' E_r}}{\sum_r \Omega(E_r)\, e^{-\beta' E_r}}\,. \tag{2}$$

Considering the system in the thermodynamic limit as well, $N \to \infty$, so that $E_r \to E$ and $\Omega(E_r)$ can be expressed as $\Omega(E)\mathrm{d}E$, where $\Omega(E)$ is now the density of states, Eq. (2) takes its continuous form as

$$P(E) = \frac{\Omega(E)\, e^{-\beta' E}\mathrm{d}E}{\int \Omega(E)\, e^{-\beta' E}\mathrm{d}E}\,. \tag{3}$$

We stress though that the passage from Eq. (2) to Eq. (3) is not strictly derived, but it is justified as the most natural choice [2].

As we have seen above, four assumptions have been invoked for the derivation of Eq. (3), i.e., the equiprobability postulate as the thermal equilibrium condition, a system of negligible energy compared to the energy of the heat bath,

*Electronic address: thomas.oikonomou@nu.edu.kz

and the thermodynamic limit of both the heat bath and the system in order to obtain continuous energies and being able to apply the calculus. It is thus scientifically an intriguing question to explore whether there is a way to derive the energy distribution in the canonical case, by minimizing or even if possible eliminating the preceding assumptions and how this would affect the final results. In an effort to answer this question, in this work, we follow a novel approach to derive the energy distribution of a system composed of N identical molecules at the canonical equilibrium. The cornerstone of our approach is, instead of equal probabilities, to use the internal energy extensivity property, i.e., the proportionality to N, as the thermal equilibrium condition. Interestingly enough then, non of the four assumptions are needed for the derivation of the canonical distribution within this approach. The results, as expected, are shown to be more general than the textbook ones, providing new perspectives within statistical thermodynamics, which we indent to explore closer in the future.

For this purpose, we first define in Section II the canonical ensemble of discrete energy states through a minimum number of statistical mechanical conditions (excluding thereby the equiprobability postulate), showing that it satisfies indeed the energy extensivity. However, the related discrete energy probability distribution P_r, is not to be considered at this stage as the canonical distribution. Its structural generality is to be reduced by requesting the validity of the equilibrium condition in the continuous limit as well. This is done in Section III, where we extend the discussion to the continuous case. The obtained continuous distribution $P(E)$ is now the canonical one and by discretizing it we determine P_r for the discrete energies levels. Our results show that the currently derived canonical distribution contains the Boltzmann factor $e^{-\beta E_j}$, as in Eq. (1), yet its origin is different and the energy factor β, in contrast to β', is not subjected a specific statistical structure. In Section V, we present some numerical results to support our findings. Finally, discussion and remarks are presented in the conclusions.

II. DISCRETE CANONICAL ENSEMBLE

In this section we will introduce the discrete energy ensemble describing a system being at canonical equilibrium. We consider therefore a closed system composed of N molecules plus the reservoir. We denote the sample space of all possible mutually exclusive discrete energies $\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}$ of the νth molecule by $\omega_\nu \equiv \{\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}\}_{i=1,\ldots,\alpha\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\nu = 1,\ldots,N$. Then, the probability of finding the νth molecule with energy $\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}$ is denoted as $p_\nu(\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)})$. It satisfies the following normalization condition

$$p_\nu(\omega_\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} p_\nu(\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}) = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad 0 < p_\nu(\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}) < 1\,, \tag{4}$$

in each sample space ω_ν. The boundary values 0 and 1 in the double inequality in Eq. (4) are excluded since $p_\nu(\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}) = 1$ would imply the existence of a unique energy value $\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}$ and $p_\nu(\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}) = 0$ would imply that $\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}$ is not a constituent element of ω_ν. In other words, ω_ν contains all the accessible energy values and only them. For the sake of simplicity, we assume in what follows that the molecules are identical, i.e., $(\omega_\nu, p_\nu) = (\omega_{\nu'}, p_{\nu'}) = (\omega, p)$. The index ν will be used, when necessary, only for heuristic reasons. Then, the canonical ensemble of the total N-molecule system is defined by the following three conditions:

C1. The sample space $\mathcal{W}$ of the energy states $\{\mathcal{A}_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,W\in\mathbb{N}}$ is determined by a the tensor product $\otimes_\wedge$ of the sets ω_ν over the conjunction operator $\bigwedge$ [3],

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W} &= \omega_1 \otimes_\wedge \omega_2 \otimes_\wedge \cdots \otimes_\wedge \omega_{N-1} \otimes_\wedge \omega_N \\ &= \left\{ \bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N} \varepsilon_1^{(\nu)}, \bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N-1} \varepsilon_1^{(\nu)} \bigwedge \varepsilon_2^{(N)}, \ldots, \bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N-1} \varepsilon_\alpha^{(\nu)} \bigwedge \varepsilon_{\alpha-1}^{(N)}, \bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N} \varepsilon_\alpha^{(\nu)} \right\} \\ &=: \left\{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_{W-1}, \mathcal{A}_W\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $W \equiv W(\alpha, N)$ is the cardinality of $\mathcal{W}$ computed as

$$W(\alpha, N) = \underbrace{\alpha \times \alpha \times \cdots \times \alpha \times \alpha}_{N \text{ times}} = \alpha^N\,. \tag{5}$$

C2. The probability of occurrence for the jth state is described by the multiplicative composition rule, e.g., $\mathcal{P}(\bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N} \varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}) = \prod_{\nu=1}^{N} p_\nu(\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)})$. $\mathcal{P}$ has to satisfy the analogous relations to Eq. (4), namely

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}) = \sum_{j=1}^{W} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_j) = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad 0 < \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_j) < 1\,, \tag{6}$$

It is worth stressing a very misused issue in literature, namely that if the energy levels $\varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}$ are statistically independent then the multiplicative composition rule holds, yet not vice versa [5]. Indeed, the application of the former composition rule may describe statistically dependent ε_i's as well.

C3. The energy $E_j \equiv E(\mathcal{A}_j)$ of the jth state is additive: if $n_{ij} \equiv n_j(\varepsilon_i)$ is the frequency of the energy value ε_i within the state $\mathcal{A}_j$, then for any j, the energy E_j is given as

$$E_j = \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} n_{ij}\varepsilon_i \qquad \text{with} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} n_{ij} = N\,. \tag{7}$$

The conjunction sign $\bigwedge$ in a configuration, e.g., $\bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N} \varepsilon_i^{(\nu)}$, simply implies: $\varepsilon_i^{(1)}$ and $\varepsilon_i^{(2)}$ and $\cdots$ and $\varepsilon_i^{(N)}$. The probability of occurrence for the jth state, due to the condition C2, is formed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_1) &= \mathcal{P}\left(\bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N} \varepsilon_1^{(\nu)}\right) = \prod_{\nu=1}^{N} p_\nu\left(\varepsilon_1^{(\nu)}\right), \\
\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_2) &= \mathcal{P}\left(\bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N-1} \varepsilon_1^{(\nu)} \bigwedge \varepsilon_2^{(N)}\right) = \prod_{\nu=1}^{N-1} p_\nu\left(\varepsilon_1^{(\nu)}\right) p_N\left(\varepsilon_2^{(N)}\right), \\
&\vdots \\
\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_{W-1}) &= \mathcal{P}\left(\bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N-1} \varepsilon_\alpha^{(\nu)} \bigwedge \varepsilon_{\alpha-1}^{(N)}\right) = \prod_{\nu=1}^{N-1} p_\nu\left(\varepsilon_\alpha^{(\nu)}\right) p_N\left(\varepsilon_{\alpha-1}^{(N)}\right), \\
\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_W) &= \mathcal{P}\left(\bigwedge_{\nu=1}^{N} \varepsilon_\alpha^{(\nu)}\right) = \prod_{\nu=1}^{N} p_\nu\left(\varepsilon_\alpha^{(\nu)}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

For identical molecules, Eq. (8) can be written in the compact form

$$\mathcal{P}_j = \prod_{i=1}^{\alpha} p_i^{n_{ij}}\,, \tag{9}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_j \equiv \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_j)$ and $p_i \equiv p(\varepsilon_i)$. By the multinomial theorem (see Appendix A for more details), we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{W} \mathcal{P}_j = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} p_i\right)^N,$$

which yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^{W} \mathcal{P}_j = 1\,, \tag{10}$$

as a result of Eq. (4). Moreover, applying the operator $p_k \frac{\partial}{\partial p_k}$ (see Appendix A), we obtain the following general relation valid within the sample space $\mathcal{W}$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{W} \mathcal{P}_j\, n_{ij} = N\, p_i \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} p_i\right)^{N-1}$$

which yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^{W} \mathcal{P}_j\, n_{ij} = N\, p_i \tag{11}$$

again as a result of Eq. (4). As can be seen here, the probability measure in Eq. (9) satisfies indeed the normalization condition as a consequence of Eq. (4) and the conditions C1-C2 for any energy value ε_i and any arbitrary structure of p_i.

Having determined the structure of the probability measure $\mathcal{P}_j$ yielding the likelihood of the occurrence of the jth state in Eq. (9), we may now consider the likelihood of the occurrence of the states with the same energy. To this aim, we relabel the $\mathcal{A}_j$ with a new index $r = 1, \ldots, w$, so that each r corresponds to a set of states exhibiting the same energy E_r. Apparently, E_r satisfies Eq. (7) for $j \to r$. Then, by virtue of Eq. (9), we determine the probability with which a state occurs with the energy E_r as

$$P_r = \Omega(E_r)\mathcal{P}_{j\to r} = \Omega(E_r)\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha} p_i^{n_{ir}}\,, \tag{12}$$

where $P_r \equiv P(E_r)$ and $\Omega(E_r)$ is the degeneracy number of the rth energy value of the system. In the general case of a nonlinear dependence of ε_i on i, $\Omega(E_r)$ is given by the multinomial coefficient with $r_{\max} \equiv w \equiv w(\alpha, N) = (N+\alpha-1)!/\big[(\alpha-1)!N!\big]$, so that $\sum_{r=1}^{w}\Omega(E_r) = W = \alpha^N$ (see Appendix A). Apparently, the energy probability distribution in Eq. (12) is normalized within $\mathcal{W}$, since $\sum_{r=1}^{w} P_r = \sum_{j=1}^{W}\mathcal{P}_j$.

By virtue of Eq. (11) then, we can show that the mean energy $\langle E\rangle$ of the ensemble $\mathcal{W}$ is proportional to the number of molecules as

$$\langle E\rangle = \sum_{r=1}^{w} P_r\,E_r = \sum_{j=1}^{W}\mathcal{P}_j\,E_j = \sum_{j=1}^{W}\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha}\mathcal{P}_j\,n_{ij}\,\varepsilon_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{W}\mathcal{P}_j\,n_{ij}\right]\varepsilon_i = N\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha}p_i\,\varepsilon_i = N\,\langle\varepsilon\rangle\,, \tag{13}$$

where $\langle\varepsilon\rangle$ is the mean energy of a single molecule. Identifying $\langle E\rangle$ with the internal energy of the system, we see that the ensemble $\mathcal{W}$ under the conditions C1-C3 satisfies indeed the thermal equilibrium condition, i.e., the energy extensivity, justifying the denomination of the discrete canonical ensemble. It is worth remarking, that Eq. (13) is valid only as long as N and α are finite, warranting the finiteness required to interchange the order of the summation.

III. CONTINUOUS CANONICAL ENSEMBLE

In this section, our aim is to derive the continuous version of Eq. (12) subject the maintenance of the energy extensivity. For this, we first need to find a passage to transit from discrete to continuous energies, $E_r \to E$. There are two options for this, the textbook one, i.e., the thermodynamic limit of the system $N \to \infty$, or $\alpha \to \infty$. Considering the discrete energy expression in Eq. (7) for $j \to r$, i.e. $E_r = \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} n_{ir}\varepsilon_i$, we can see that the only quantity exhibiting a dependence on N is the frequency n_{ir} of finding the energy value ε_i within the energy state $\mathcal{A}_r$. However, irrespective of the number of the constituent molecules of the system the image of n_{ir} is always an integer number. Therefore, considering the limit $N \to \infty$, the energy values E_r do not become continuous. Thus, the only option left for the system energy to become continuous is to assume that the discrete energy values $\varepsilon_i \in [a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ becomes more and more numerous for increasing α [6]. In this way, for $\alpha \to \infty$ these discrete energies become continuous, $\varepsilon_i \to \varepsilon$ ($E_r \to E$), albeit in the same range $[a, b]$ ($[Na, Nb]$). Accordingly, in the former limit the difference between two successive energy values tends to zero, $\Delta\varepsilon_i \to 0$ ($\Delta E_r \to 0$).

Following Jaynes [6], we then consider the respective discrete energy probability distribution as

$$p(\varepsilon_i) = \frac{f(\varepsilon_i)\Delta\varepsilon_i^*}{z_d}\,, \qquad\qquad z_d := \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} f(\varepsilon_i)\Delta\varepsilon_i^*\,, \tag{14}$$

where $\Delta\varepsilon_i^* := \varepsilon_{i+1}^* - \varepsilon_i^*$ with $\varepsilon_1^* \equiv \varepsilon_1$, $\varepsilon_{\alpha+1}^* \equiv \varepsilon_\alpha$ and $\varepsilon_{1<i\le\alpha}^* \in [\varepsilon_{i-1}, \varepsilon_i]$. In the limit $\alpha \to \infty$ we have $\Delta\varepsilon_i \to 0$ and thus $\Delta\varepsilon_i^* \to 0$, so that the measure $p(\varepsilon_i)$ takes its continuous form as

$$p(\varepsilon) = \frac{f(\varepsilon)\mathrm{d}\varepsilon}{z}\,, \qquad\qquad z = \int_a^b f(\varepsilon)\mathrm{d}\varepsilon\,, \tag{15}$$

where $\lim_{\alpha\to\infty} f(\varepsilon_i) \to f(\varepsilon)$ is assumed. The substitution of Eq. (14) into Eq. (12) yields

$$P(E_r) = \frac{F(E_r)\,\Delta E_r^*}{Z_d} \tag{16}$$

with $Z_d := z_d^N$ and

$$F(E_r) := \frac{\Omega(E_r)}{\Delta E_r^*}\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} n_{ir}\ln\big(f(\varepsilon_i)\Delta\varepsilon_i^*\big)\right)\,, \tag{17}$$

where $\Delta E_r^* := E_{r+1}^* - E_r^*$, $E_1^* \equiv E_1$, $E_{w+1}^* \equiv E_w$, $E_{1<r\leq w}^* \in [E_{w-1}, E_w]$ and $E_r \in [Na, Nb] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. $F(E_r)$ converges to a continuous function $F(E)$ for $\alpha \to \infty$ i.e., $F(E) := \lim_{\alpha\to\infty} F(E_r)$ (see Appendix B), so that the energy probability distribution in Eq. (16) becomes continuous as well

$$P(E) = \frac{F(E)\mathrm{d}E}{Z}\,, \qquad\qquad Z = \int_{Na}^{Nb} F(E)\,\mathrm{d}E = \left(\int_a^b f(\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}\varepsilon\right)^N = z^N\,. \tag{18}$$

In order to proceed further, we assume that both Z and z depend on an external positive parameter called β whose physical meaning is undetermined for now. Having assumed this dependence, we take the logarithm of both sides of the equation above, namely $Z = z^N$, and then take derivative of both sides with respect to β. This yields

$$\frac{1}{Z}\int_{Na}^{Nb} \frac{\partial F(E,\beta)}{\partial\beta}\mathrm{d}E = \frac{N}{z}\int_a^b \frac{\partial f(\varepsilon,\beta)}{\partial\beta}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon\,. \tag{19}$$

Enforcing the extensivity of the mean energy i.e., $\langle E\rangle = N\,\langle\varepsilon\rangle$ (see Eq. (13) above), also in the continuous case, leaves us with the following two distinct conditions: either one has

$$\frac{\partial F(E,\beta)}{\partial\beta} = E\,F(E,\beta) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{\partial f(\varepsilon,\beta)}{\partial\beta} = \varepsilon\,f(\varepsilon,\beta)\,. \tag{20}$$

or

$$\frac{\partial F(E,\beta)}{\partial\beta} = -E\,F(E,\beta) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{\partial f(\varepsilon,\beta)}{\partial\beta} = -\varepsilon\,f(\varepsilon,\beta)\,. \tag{21}$$

In fact, both conditions satisfy the extensivity property $\langle E\rangle = N\,\langle\varepsilon\rangle$ in the form

$$\langle E\rangle = \pm\int_{Na}^{Nb} EP(E) = \pm\frac{1}{Z}\int_{Na}^{Nb} EF(E,\beta)\mathrm{d}E \pm = N\int_a^b \varepsilon p(\varepsilon) = \pm\frac{N}{z}\int_a^b \varepsilon f(\varepsilon,\beta)\mathrm{d}\varepsilon = N\,\langle\varepsilon\rangle \tag{22}$$

in accordance with Eq. (18). The conditions (20)-(21) yield

$$F(E,\beta) = \Phi(E)e^{\pm\beta E}\,, \qquad\qquad f(\varepsilon,\beta) = \phi(\varepsilon)e^{\pm\beta\varepsilon}\,. \tag{23}$$

where the plus sign corresponds to the solution of Eq. (20) while the minus sign corresponds to the solution of Eq. (21). Substituting these two distinct solutions into Eqs. (15) and (18), we obtain

$$p(\varepsilon) = \frac{\phi(\varepsilon)e^{\pm\beta\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon}{z}\,, \qquad P(E) = \frac{\Phi(E)e^{\pm\beta E}\mathrm{d}E}{Z}\,. \tag{24}$$

However, since the condition with the plus sign above causes the probability distribution to diverge for high energies ($E \to \infty$), the relevant sign has to be minus. Therefore, we finally obtain the continuous version of the canonical distribution as

$$p(\varepsilon) = \frac{\phi(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon}{z}\,, \qquad P(E) = \frac{\Phi(E)e^{-\beta E}\mathrm{d}E}{Z}\,, \tag{25}$$

with

$$Z = \int_{Na}^{Nb} \Phi(E)e^{-\beta E}\,\mathrm{d}E = \left(\int_a^b \phi(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\,\mathrm{d}\varepsilon\right)^N = z^N\,. \tag{26}$$

Apparently, the relation between Φ and ϕ is uniquely determined by the finite inverse Laplace transformation [8]

$$\Phi(E) = \frac{1}{2\pi\mathrm{i}}\int_{\beta'-\mathrm{i}\infty}^{\beta'+\mathrm{i}\infty}\left[\int_a^b \phi(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon\right]^N e^{\beta E}\mathrm{d}\beta\,. \tag{27}$$

The probability $P(E)$ reduces to $p(\varepsilon)$ for $N = 1$ as expected. However, note that $P(E)$ is valid for any number of molecules (see also Ref. [9] for a similar reasoning along the lines of resolving the Gibbs paradox).

As we have seen above, in the current approach the canonical energy distribution in Eq. (25) is derived based on two relations, i.e., $Z = z^N$ and $\langle E\rangle = N\,\langle\varepsilon\rangle$. The former relation is obtained from the ensemble conditions C1 and C2, and the latter relation is obtained when all three ensemble conditions C1-C3 are taken into account. When this is the case, then the Boltzmann factor $e^{-\beta E}$ in the canonical energy distribution emerges.

IV. DERIVATION OF $\Phi(E)$ FOR $\beta^{-1}-$PROPORTIONAL ENERGIES

We we want to derive the most general expression of the function $\Phi(E)$ for the case where the ensemble energy is inverse proportional to β. Since the mean energy of the ensemble is extensive, we shall only consider a single molecule, thus

$$\langle\varepsilon\rangle = \frac{\lambda}{\beta}\,, \tag{28}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the proportionality constant. Writing explicitly the averaging formula we obtain

$$\frac{\int_0^\infty \varepsilon\,\phi(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon}{\int_0^\infty \phi(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon} = \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \int_0^\infty \varepsilon\,\phi(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\beta}\int_0^\infty \lambda\,\phi(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon \tag{29}$$

Partial integration of the l.h.s. yields

$$-\frac{1}{\beta}\varepsilon\,\phi(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\Big|_0^\infty + \frac{1}{\beta}\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\Big[\phi(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon\phi'(\varepsilon)\Big]\mathrm{d}\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\beta}\int_0^\infty \lambda\,\phi(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon \tag{30}$$

The first term is equal to zero, assuming a finite contribution of $\phi(0)$. Then, we obtain the following differential equation to solve

$$\phi(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon\phi'(\varepsilon) = \lambda\phi(\varepsilon) \tag{31}$$

yielding

$$\phi(\varepsilon) = c\,\varepsilon^{\lambda-1}\,. \tag{32}$$

Substituting the former result in Eq. (27) we determine the function $\Phi(E)$ for $\beta > 0$ as

$$\Phi(E) = \frac{c^N\Gamma^N(\lambda)}{\Gamma(\lambda N)}E^{\lambda N-1}\,. \tag{33}$$

Then, the probabilities $p(\varepsilon)$ and $P(E)$ are computed to be

$$p(\varepsilon) = \frac{\beta^\lambda}{\Gamma(\lambda)}\,\varepsilon^{\lambda-1}e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\varepsilon\,, \qquad P(E) = \frac{\beta^{\lambda N}}{\Gamma(\lambda N)}E^{\lambda N-1}e^{-\beta\,E}\mathrm{d}E\,, \tag{34}$$

from which we determine the mean energy as well, namely

$$\langle E\rangle = \frac{\lambda N}{\beta} = N\,\langle\varepsilon\rangle\ . \tag{35}$$

This is a novel result. Obviously, $P(E)$ yields $p(\varepsilon)$ for $N = 1$. Since the energy probability distribution functions $p(\varepsilon)$ and $P(E)$ have to be dimensionless, we read that the parameter λ is a merely a number while the factor β has the dimension of inverse energy. Comparing this result with the kinetic gas theory we identify $\beta = (k_{\mathrm{B}}T)^{-1}$. The value of λ depends on the on-molecule potential and the degrees of freedom of a system's molecule.

V. SYSTEM-HEAT BATH INTERACTION

In this section we shall apply numerical analysis to verify our theoretical results. Namely, the canonical distribution is valid as long as the system-heat bath interaction preserve the conditions C1-C3, irrespective of the size of the heat bath.

For our purpose we shall consider a system of N free molecules embedded in an one dimensional heat bath comprised of N_{HB} molecules. Considering the Langevin dynamic of the free molecules system under consideration with unity mass, the system-heat bath interaction is described by a white noise ξ satisfying the properties $\langle\xi_\nu(t)\rangle = 0$, $\left\langle\xi_\nu^2(t)\right\rangle = 2\gamma k_{\mathrm{B}}T$, i.e.,

$$\dot{v}_\nu = -\gamma v_\nu + \xi_\nu(t)\,, \tag{36}$$



FIG. 1: a) The distribution of the Compound Poisson Process ΔX is calculated over $2 * 10^6$ integration points and plotted for various values of λ. For very large value of λ ΔX tends to the Wiener process. b) The system's energy $\langle E \rangle$ is calculated for $N = 1, \ldots, 10$ numbers of constituent molecules demonstrating its extensivity as well in an infinite heat bath $\lambda \to \infty$ as in a finite heat bath $\lambda = 800$.

where γ is the drift parameter, v_ν and x_ν are the νth molecule velocity and position, respectively, and V is the on-molecule potential. T denotes the heat bath's temperature and $k_{\rm B}$ is the Boltzmann constant. From the well known equilibrium expression of the average square velocity obtained from the Langevin dynamic, we are able to identify the factor β with the inverse temperature as $\beta = (k_{\rm B}T)^{-1}$ and $\lambda = 1/2$, so that the energy probability density in Eq. (34) reduces to

$$\rho_p(\varepsilon) \sim \varepsilon^{-1/2} e^{-\beta\varepsilon}\,, \qquad \rho_P(E) \sim E^{N/2-1} e^{-\beta\, E}\,, \tag{37}$$

If the heat bath is of infinite size, then due to the Central Limit Theorem, the noise is justified to be described by a Gaussian distribution density. For a finite heat bath on the other hand, the white noise is commonly modeled by the Poisson jump-noise [10]

$$\xi(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{n(t)} z_k \delta(t - \tau_k) - \mu \langle z \rangle\ . \tag{38}$$

The physical meaning of μ is the average number of collisions per time interval Δt. When $\mu \to \infty$ then the Poisson noise recovers the Gaussian noise (infinite many collisions).

For our numerical simulations we set $\gamma = 0.1$, $N = 10$ and $\beta = 2$ and rewrite the Langevin dynamics using the numerical solution's scheme in Ref. [11] as

$$v(t_{i+1}) = v(t_i) - \gamma v(t_i)\Delta t + \Delta X_i\,, \tag{39}$$

where ΔX is the Compound Poisson Process. The former tends to the Wiener Process for $\mu \to \infty$ (see Ref. [11] for details). This behaviour is demonstrated in Fig. 1a) recording the distribution of ΔX for four values of μ. As we can see, by increasing μ the distribution become as expected more and more symmetric around zero approaching the Wiener process. Practically, we see that when μ is of the order of magnitude 10^6 we are in the regime of an infinite heat bath. Accordingly, for lower orders of magnitude the heat is considered to be finite. In Fig. 1b) we have plotted the mean energy of the system depending on the number of molecules $N = 1, \ldots, 10$, for $\lambda = 800$, corresponding to a finite heat bath and for $\lambda \to \infty$ corresponding to an infinite heat bath. We can see that the extensivity property holds in both cases as predicted by our results.

The numerical energy distributions (red circles) and the respective theoretical formula function (black solid line) in Eq. (37) for a single molecule in a finite ($\lambda = 800$) and in an infinite heat bath are presented in Figs. 2a) and 2b), respectively. As can be seen, the numerical results are in full agreement with the theoretical ones. Similarly, in Figs. 3a) and 3b) we plot the energy distribution of the entire system of $N = 10$ molecules, for the preceding finite and infinite heat bath, respectively.



FIG. 2: The free molecule continuous energy distributions of a single molecule (randomly chosen) a) in a finite heat bath ($\lambda = 800$) and b) in an infinite heat bath ($\lambda \to \infty$) log-linear scale are recorded. The red circles represent the numerically obtained data over 2×10^6 integration points and the solid black line is the theoretical curve in Eq. (37).



FIG. 3: The free molecule continuous energy distributions of the total system of $N = 10$ molecules a) in a finite heat bath ($\lambda = 800$) and b) in an infinite heat bath ($\lambda \to \infty$) log-linear scale are recorded. The red circles represent the numerically obtained data over 2×10^6 integration points and the solid black line is the theoretical curve in Eq. (37).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Considering discreteness as the point of departure and relying only on the multiplicative probabilistic composition rule and additivity of the energy, we have shown that the extensivity of the mean energy follows even for finite number of molecules. Then, extending our analysis to the continuous case, we have explicitly derived the canonical distribution without invoking the thermodynamic limit. The derivation also shows that the usual assumption of the equal a priori probabilities is redundant for obtaining the canonical distribution. We demonstrate numerically the emergence of the canonical distribution for systems composed of finite number of molecules exhibiting extensive mean energy behaviour using the one dimensional Langevin thermostat.

Finally, we note some differences between our work and the one by Khinchin [12]: first, Khinchin makes use of equal a priori probabilities in order to obtain the canonical distribution whereas the present work only uses the statistical independence (see C1 and C2 above). Second, the canonical distribution is obtained only in the thermodynamic limit according to Khinchin while we have shown that the canonical distribution can be obtained without such a limit. In this sense, we have shown that the inverse power law distributions are not obtained as a result of the finiteness of the bath [13, 14].

Of particular interest in our approach is the function $\Phi(E)$ (or $\phi(\varepsilon)$), which can be essentially any arbitrary function.

It is worth studying in a separate work whether and how its explicit structure depends on the number of molecules of the heat bath, or in other words, if its expression is determined from the heat bath - system interaction.

Appendix A: Proof of Eqs. (10)-(11)

In Eq. (5), we have determined the cardinality W of the sample space $\mathcal{W}$ by multiplying the cardinalities of all the single molecules sample spaces ω_ν. A more detailed way of computing W is by means of the degeneracy number $\Omega(E_r)$ since by definition we must have $\sum_{r=1}^{w}\Omega(E_r)=\sum_{j=1}^{W}1=W$. As explained in Section II, $\Omega(E_r)$ of the ensemble $\mathcal{W}$ is given by the multinomial coefficient

$$\Omega(E_r)=\frac{N!}{\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha}n_{ir}!}=\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha-1}\binom{N-\sum_{k=1}^{i-1}n_{kr}}{n_{ir}} \tag{40}$$

The summation over all r-energy states is equal to the summation of all frequencies, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{r=1}^{w}\Omega(E_r) &= \sum_{n_{1r}=0}^{N}\sum_{n_{2r}=0}^{N-n_1}\cdots\sum_{n_{\alpha-1,r}=0}^{N-\sum_{k=1}^{\alpha-2}n_{kr}}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha-1}\binom{N-\sum_{k=1}^{i-1}n_{kr}}{n_{ir}}\right]\\ &= \sum_{n_{1r}=0}^{N}\binom{N}{n_{1r}}\sum_{n_{2r}=0}^{N-n_1}\binom{N-n_{1r}}{n_{2r}}\cdots\sum_{n_{\alpha-1,r}=0}^{N-\sum_{k=1}^{\alpha-2}n_{kr}}\binom{N-\sum_{k=1}^{\alpha-2}n_{kr}}{n_{\alpha-1,r}}=\alpha^N\,.\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Here we have used the relation $\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha}n_{ij}=N$ in Eq. (7). Regarding now the normalization of the probabilities P_j in Eq. (9) it is fully equivalent to study it in terms of the normalization P_r in Eq. (12). Rewriting P_r as follows

$$P_r=\Omega(E_r)\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha}p_i^{n_{ir}}=\Omega(E_r)p_\alpha^{N-\sum_{k=1}^{\alpha-1}n_{kr}}\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha-1}p_i^{n_{ir}}=\Omega(E_r)p_\alpha^N\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha-1}\left(\frac{p_i}{p_\alpha}\right)^{n_{ir}}=p_\alpha^N\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha-1}\binom{N-\sum_{k=1}^{i-1}n_{kr}}{n_{ir}}\left(\frac{p_i}{p_\alpha}\right)^{n_{ir}}\,, \tag{42}$$

we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{W}P_j=\sum_{r=1}^{w}P_r=p_\alpha^N\sum_{n_{1r}=0}^{N}\sum_{n_{2r}=0}^{N-n_1}\cdots\sum_{n_{\alpha-1,r}=0}^{N-\sum_{k=1}^{\alpha-2}n_{kr}}\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha-1}\binom{N-\sum_{k=1}^{i-1}n_{kr}}{n_{ir}}\left(\frac{p_i}{p_\alpha}\right)^{n_{ir}}\,. \tag{43}$$

Then, from the Multinomial Theorem [7] we know the result of the r.h.s. of Eq. (43), namely

$$\sum_{j=1}^{W}P_j=\sum_{r=1}^{w}P_r=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha}p_i\right)^N\,, \tag{44}$$

which is exactly the result right above Eq. (10). Moreover, applying the operator $p_k\frac{\partial}{\partial p_k}$ on Eq. (44), using the analytical expression of P_j in Eq. (9), we obtain

$$p_k\frac{\partial}{\partial p_k}\sum_{j=1}^{W}P_j=p_k\frac{\partial}{\partial p_k}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha}p_i\right)^N\qquad\Longrightarrow\qquad\sum_{j=1}^{W}P_j\;n_{ij}=N\,p_i\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha}p_i\right)^{N-1}\,, \tag{45}$$

which is exactly the result above Eq. (11). Taking into account the normalization of the single molecule probabilities in Eq. (5), Eqs. (44) and (45) yield the results in Eqs. (10) and (11), respectively.

Appendix B: Convergence of Eq. (17)

The energy value E_r in Eq. (7) for $j\to r$, can be rewritten as

$$E_r=\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha}n_{ir}\varepsilon_i=N\,\langle\varepsilon\rangle_r\,, \tag{46}$$

so that the difference between two successive energy states of the ensemble is equal to

$$\Delta E_r = N\left[\langle\varepsilon\rangle_{r+1} - \langle\varepsilon\rangle_r\right] . \tag{47}$$

Here we can read the following. The higher α is the more molecule energy states ε_i we have with less distance between them, so that for great values of α we get

$$\lim_{\alpha\to\infty} \Delta E_r \to \mathrm{d}E\,. \tag{48}$$

Next, we want to explore its convergence when $r \to \infty$ or equivalently $\alpha \to \infty$ (the latter is a necessary and sufficient condition to the former limit for finite N) of the discrete function $F(E_r)$ in Eq. (17). Considering now $F(E_r)$ as sequence $F_r := F(E_r)$ we shall use the following convergence criterion (ratio test),

$$\text{If} \qquad \lim_{r\to\infty}\left|\frac{F_{r+1}}{F_r}\right| = \lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\left|\frac{F_{r+1}}{F_r}\right| < 1 \qquad \text{then} \qquad F_r \to F\,. \tag{49}$$

This criterion shows that the sequence F_r converges to a value F when α is taken into consideration. Then, we have

$$\lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\left|\frac{F_{r+1}}{F_r}\right| = \lim_{\alpha\to\infty} \underbrace{\left|\frac{\Omega(E_{r+1})}{\Omega(E_r)}\right|}_{=:G_1} \underbrace{\left|\frac{\Delta E^*_{r+1}}{\Delta E^*_r}\right|}_{=:G_2} \underbrace{\left|\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha-1}\Delta n_{ir}\ln\left(f(\varepsilon_i)\Delta\varepsilon_i^*\right)\right)\right|}_{=:G_3}, \tag{50}$$

where $\Delta n_{ir} := n_{i,r+1} - n_{ir}$. By virtue of Eq. (48) we then have

$$\lim_{\alpha\to\infty} G_1 = \lim_{\alpha\to\infty} G_2 = 1\,. \tag{51}$$

Regarding the last term G_3, we observe that the term Δn_{ir} takes values in the range $[0, N]$, namely finite values for finite N. On the other hand, assuming that $f(\varepsilon_i)$ converges to a continuous function, $f(\varepsilon_i)\Delta\varepsilon_i^*$ is less than unity in the continuous limit, so that $\ln\left(f(\varepsilon_i)\Delta\varepsilon_i^*\right) \to -\infty$ and accordingly

$$\lim_{\alpha\to\infty} G_3 = 0\,. \tag{52}$$

Therefore, the convergence criterion in Eq. (49) is satisfied for any energy value as long as the function f converges.

Acknowledgments

GBB thanks the Nazarbayev University for funding his visit there.

[1] R. K. Pathria & P.D. Beale, (2011). *Statistical mechanics* Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, p.41.
[2] D. Chandler, (1987). *Introduction to modern statistical mechanics* Oxford University Press, Oxford, p.65.
[3] An example of the tensor product over the conjuction operator is presented. For $\alpha = 2 = N$ we have $\mathcal{W} = \omega_1 \otimes_\wedge \omega_2 = \{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\} \otimes_\wedge \{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\} = \{\varepsilon_1 \wedge \{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}, \varepsilon_2 \wedge \{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}\} = \{\varepsilon_1 \wedge \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 \wedge \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_2 \wedge \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \wedge \varepsilon_2\}$. For the sake of simplicity we denote the former four ($W = 4$) configurations as $\{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3, \mathcal{A}_4\}$.
[4] D. P. Bertsekas & J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Introduction to probability* Massachusetts: Athena Scientific, 2008.
[5] As an illustration of this subtle point, one can consider for example two independent rolls of a die so that the following three events may be observed: $A = \{$1st roll is 1, 2, or 3$\}$, $B = \{$1st roll is 3, 4, or 5$\}$, $C = \{$the sum of the two rolls is 9$\}$. These events are not independent from one another as can be checked, e.g., from the relation $P(A \cap B) = \frac{1}{6} \neq \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2} = P(A)\,P(B)$. On the other hand, one can see that the multiplicative composition rule is still satisfied as can be seen from the equality $P(A \cap B \cap C) = \frac{1}{36} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}\frac{4}{36} = P(A)\,P(B)\,P(C)$ (see Ref. [4] for more on this issue).
[6] E. T. Jaynes (2003), *Probability Theory: The logic of science*, Cambrige: Cambridge University Press, p.374.
[7] E. Gosset (2003), *Discrete Mathematics with Proof*, Pearson Education: New Jersey, p.237.
[8] L. Debnath, D. Bhatta (2007), *Integral Transforms and Their Applications, Second Edition*, Chapman & Hall/CRC, p.430.
[9] T. Oikonomou & G. B. Bagci, (2013). Clausius versus Sackur-Tetrode entropies. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **44**, 63.
[10] M. Köpke and J. Ankerhold (2013), New J. Phys. **15** 043013
[11] C. Kim, E.- K. Lee, P. Hänggi and P. Talkner (2007), Phys. Rev. E **76**, 011109.
[12] A. I. Khinchin (1949), Mathematical foundations of Statistical Mechanics, New York: Dover Publication.
[13] M. Campisi, F. Zhan and P. Hänggi (2012), On the origin of power laws in equilibrium, *EPL* **99** 60004.
[14] G. B. Bagci and T. Oikonomou (2013), Tsallis power laws and finite baths with negative heat capacity, *Phys. Rev. E* **88** 042126.